Docket No.: 74688/P004CP1D1/10804933 (PATENT)

Examiner: Q. H. Vu

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: Raymond P. Feith et al.

Application No.: 10/816,183 Confirmation No.: 7854

Filed: March 31, 2004 Art Unit: 3763

For: MULTI-VALVE INJECTION/ASPIRATION

MANIFOLD WITH NEEDLELESS ACCESS

CONNECTION

## INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant's Record Under § 713.04 of Telephone Interview With Examiner

Applicant respectfully submits the following record of the telephone interview of June 17, 2009, under M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

The following persons participated in the interview: Examiner Q. H. Vu and Applicant's attorney Craig Cox and Applicant's representative George Mansour. Applicant thanks Examiner Vu for the time and effort to conduct the interview.

In the interview Applicant's attorney and George Mansour, Product Development Engineer for the assignee of the present application, discussed support in the written description for the limitations added in the RCE of February 24, 2009. The Examiner did not take a position with respect to Applicant's arguments against the § 112, first paragraph issues raised in the office action dated April 30, 2009.

Applicant's attorney and George Mansour then discussed the Richmond reference and pointed out to the Examiner that her reading of the Richmond reference with respect to claim limitation requiring a second pressure resulting from fluid in the flow channel, the second

Application No.: 10/816,183 Docket No.: 74688/P004CP1D1/10804933

pressure greater than the first pressure of the fluid in the flow channel is inconsistent with the drawings and specification of Richmond. Applicant further pointed out that the Examiner's reliance on elements 82 and 83 as showing a second valve seat is similarly inconsistent with the express teachings of Richmond. No resolution was reached with respect to the Richmond reference.

Applicant's attorney and George Mansour then discussed the Blomquist reference and demonstrated how Blomquist does not include a second valve seat used to form a second seal with the valve element and the second valve seat in response to a second pressure, the second pressure resulting from fluid in the flow channel, the second pressure greater than the first pressure of the fluid in the flow channel, as Blomquist is a simple two way valve that responds to any pressure differential by opening to equalize the pressure on either side of the valve. No resolution was reached with respect to the Blomquist reference and related rejection.

Please charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayment during the pendency of this Application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees to Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 74688/P004CP1D1/10804933 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 31, 2009

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filling system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: August 31, 2009

Signature: (Lisa deCordova)

Craig J. Cox

Registration No.: 39,643

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800

Dallas, Texas 75201-2784

(214) 855-7142

(214) 855-8200 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

80623042.1